



IFW



Docket No.: 264633US0PCT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/519,850

Applicants: Toru NONAMI

Filing Date: January 13, 2005

For: HYDRAULIC COMPOSITE MATERIAL HAVING
PHOTOCATALYTIC FUNCTION AND METHOD
FOR PRODUCTION THEREOF

Group Art Unit: 1775

Examiner: SPEER, TIMOTHY M.

SIR:


Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon


Jay E. Rowe, Jr., Ph.D.
Registration No. 58,948

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)



DOCKET NO: 264633US0PCT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

RE APPLICATION OF

TORU NONAMI

SERIAL NO: 10/519,850

FILED: JANUARY 13, 2005

FOR: HYDRAULIC COMPOSITE
MATERIAL HAVING
PHOTOCATALYTIC FUNCTION AND
METHOD FOR PRODUCTION THEREOF

:

: EXAMINER: SPEER, TIMOTHY M.

:

: GROUP ART UNIT: 1775

:

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 17, 2007, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-6 and 12, for examination.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been divided into groups as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-6 and 12, drawn to a composite material.

Group II: Claims 7-11, drawn to a method of producing a composite material.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-6 and 12, for examination.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the Examiner if restriction is not required (MPEP §803). Moreover, when citing lack of unity of invention, in a national